SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDAN	ITS		
MARIE JOHNSON				NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.		
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff		County of Resid	ence of First Listed Defendant		
	me, Address, Telephone No	imber and Email Add	ress)			
Craig Thor Kimmel, E Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike	•		1	N LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, U: .AND INVOLVED. vn)	SE THE LOCATION OF THE	
Ambler, PA 19002						
(215) 540-8888	TOMICAL			an antisorner a charge		
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP ((For Diversity Cases)	OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES Only)	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
O 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Yederal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	PTF DEF D I D I Incorporated or Prof Business in Thi		
Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	☐ 2 ☐ 2 Incorporated and of Business In		
		-	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	☐ 6 ☐ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI						
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 1210 Land Condemnation 1220 Foreclosure 1230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 1240 Torts to Land 1245 Tort Product Liability 1290 All Other Real Property	Shander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJUR 362 Personal Injury Med. Malpracial 365 Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO 510 Motions to Vacal Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Ot 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	G20 Other Food & Drug G25 Drug Related Seizu of Property 21 USC G30 Liquor Laws G40 R.R. & Truck G50 Airline Regs. G60 Occupational TY	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERALTAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS.—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antirust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
□ 2 R	tate Court	Appellate Court	J 4 Reinstated or J 5 Reopened	Transferred from another district (specify) 6 Multidist Litigation	n Judament	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	AN			ictional statutes unless diversity):	8	
		use: ction Practices A				
VII. REQUESTED IN GHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			N DEMANDS	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	r if demanded in complaint: : ☑ Yes ☐ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS		JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
Explanation:			7,			
1-14	41		//			
DATE	Н	SIGNATURE O	F ATTORNEY OF RECO	RD		

Case 2:11-cv-00259-LDD Document 1 Filed 01/14/11 Page 2 of 11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA - DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. Vegas. NV Address of Plaintiff: Address of Defendant: Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? Yes (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? YcsD. RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Date Terminated: Case Number: _ Judge Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No No 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated nction in this court? $Y_{CS}\square$ 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Ycs terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes□ CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1.

Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2.

Airplane Personal Injury 2. D FELA 3. D Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. D Assault, Defamation 4. D Antitrust 4. D Marine Personal Injury I Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. Patent 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please □ Labor-Management Relations specify) 7. D Products Liability 7. D Civil Rights 8. Products Liability - Asbestos 8. D Habeas Corpus 9. D All other Diversity Cases 9. D Securities Act(s) Cases □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. WAll other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. \$1692 (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule \$2.2. Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

CIV. 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM Marie Johnson NCO Financial Systems CIVIL ACTION NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:				
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.				
b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.				
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.				
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.				
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)				
f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.	(4)			
1-14-11 Crarg Ther Kimmel Marie Johnson Attorney-at-law Attorney for Attorney for Kimmel@creditlaw	— <u>). c</u> om			

Telephone

FAX Number

E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EASTERN DISTR	RICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
MARIE JOHNSON, Plaintiff v. NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, Defendant))))) Case No.:)) COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR) JURY TRIAL)) (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)
<u>CC</u>	OMPLAINT
MARIE JOHNSON ("Plaintiff"), b	by her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.
alleges the following against NCO FINANC	CIAL SYSTEMS ("Defendant"):
INTE	RODUCTION
1. Plaintiff's Complaint is bas	sed on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15
U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").	
JURISDIC [*]	TION AND VENUE
2. Jurisdiction of this court ari	ses pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states
that such actions may be brought and heard	l before "any appropriate United States district cour
without regard to the amount in controvers	sy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original
jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under	the laws of the United States.
Defendant conducts business	and has its principal office in the Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania, and therefore, personal jurisd	liction is established.

- 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).
- 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101.
- 7. Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. §1692K(a), and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec 22, 2000).
- Defendant is a debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.

- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

19

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. Defendant and others it retained began in or around April of 2010 constantly and continuously placing harassing and abusive collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt of another person.
- 16. Upon information and belief, the alleged debt Defendant was seeking to collect arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Defendant and its employees, specifically "Ms. Langford" and "Sandra Thomas", placed calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone, number.
- 18. Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her cellular telephone two (2) to five (5) times a day.
 - 19. Defendant identified the debtor as "Roy Johnson".
- 20. Plaintiff spoke with Defendant and others it retained on numerous occasions to advise that "Roy Johnson" did not live with her, that Defendant had the wrong telephone number, and not to contact her anymore.
- 21. In May of 2010, Plaintiff sent Defendant a letter restating that "Roy Johnson" did not own cellular telephone number XXX-XXXX (omitted), Plaintiff did.
- 22. Plaintiff even provided Defendant with "Roy Johnson's" correct mailing address, in her May 2010 letter.
- 23. Despite Plaintiff's instructions not to contact her, Defendant and others it retained still continued to contact Plaintiff in its attempts to collect a debt.
- 24. Defendant and others it retained repeatedly contacted Plaintiff for at least six (6) months in its attempts to collect a debt.
 - 25. Plaintiff has been told by Defendant's agent 's that the calls would continue since

Defendant's files indicated that "Roy Johnson's" number was 702-521-2090 and therefore that was "his" number.

- 26. Plaintiff informed Defendant's agent that she viewed the continued calls as harassment, Defendant's agent told Plaintiff "too bad" and hung up on her.
- 27. Plaintiff used her cellular telephone as her work telephone and found the repetitive calls by Defendant to be disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy.
- 28. Defendant failed to investigate or verify contact information prior to and after calling Plaintiff.
 - 29. Defendant failed to update its records to avoid further harassment of Plaintiff.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 30. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 31. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services. Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be

ļ

..20.

construed liberally in favor of the consumer." <u>Johnson v. Riddle</u>, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

32. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 33. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated § 1692b(2) of the FDCPA by informing Plaintiff that another person owed a debt;
 - Defendant violated § 1692b(3) of the FDCPA by calling Plaintiff more than
 once in connection for the collection of a debt for another individual;

- d. Defendant violated § 1692c(b) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff about a debt allegedly owed by another individual;
- e. Defendant violated § 1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
- f. Defendant violated § 1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
- g. Defendant violated § 1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- h. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, MARIE JOHNSON, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutor y damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to
 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

l 2 3 case. 4 5 DATED: 1-14-11 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, MARIE JOHNSON, demands a jury trial in this

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID # 57100 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (215) 540-8817

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com